

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, MASS., 1892.

The Remonstrance is addressed to the Legislatures of the several States by Women Remonstrants against the extension of the suffrage to women. It expresses the views of such Remonstrants in Massachusetts, Maine, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

AVERAGE WOMEN.

In objecting to women's voting we must recollect that while there are exceptional women in whose hands the voting power would be safe, these women are few. It is the average woman whom we must consider if we expect to place suffrage in their hands.

And who are these average women? Mostly foreigners, without education, ignorant of the first principles of a republican form of government. What do such women know about great measures of polity? about the management of political machinery? about the fitness of candidates for the offices of government?

The great danger that threatens every republic is the ignorance of the masses, who, in fact, conduct that form of government. It is the influx of foreign ignorance *en masse* that threatens our own country hourly. A republic is a splendid theory but it demands theoretic men to sustain; ignore it as we may, there are millions of men in the world for whom despotism is a necessity, and it is this class who immigrate to us every day, who are undermining our institutions and shaking the very pillars whereon the house standeth, like their vengeful prototype. If Woman Suffrage is to be allowed we double not only the numerical force of this threatening majority, but its moral—or immoral—influence.

It might be well enough if only exceptional women were allowed the ballot, but who can or will make that distinction? and how shall it be enforced? It is clearly impossible. — *Rose Terry Cooke, Pittsfield, Mass.*

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

RESULTS IN 1889.

Bills to confer municipal suffrage upon women were defeated in the Legislatures of Maine, Dakota, Ohio, Nebraska, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York. Proposed Constitutional Amendments were defeated in the Legislatures of Nevada and Connecticut. Suffrage propositions were rejected by Constitutional Conventions in New Hampshire, Montana, and North Dakota. In the new State of Washington, a woman suffrage article in the Constitution was submitted to the vote of the people and rejected by a vote of about two to one. A license suffrage bill was defeated in the Massachusetts Legislature and a similar bill and a school suffrage bill also in the Connecticut Legislature. The defeat of the suffrage article in Washington was specially significant, because the women of that Territory enjoyed the ballot for five years, prior to the adverse decision of the Supreme Court, and the people were presumably familiar with the workings of the suffrage experiment.

RESULTS IN 1890.

In North Dakota, March 4, a Senate bill submitting to a vote of the people a Constitutional Amendment giving women the right to vote was defeated in the House after an animated debate.

In New York, April 28, the Assembly rejected a municipal woman suffrage bill: yeas, 48; nays, 60. The adverse vote was considerably heavier than in 1889.

In Massachusetts, April 17, the House rejected a municipal woman suffrage bill: 73 yeas; nays, 141, including pairs. In 1889, the vote on a similar bill was 90 yeas; 139 nays, including pairs. The vote of 1890, therefore, shows a net loss of 19 for the bill.

In Mississippi, in the Constitutional Convention, the Committee on Suffrage reported favorably, 17 to 11, on a proposition giving full suffrage to all women owning property worth \$400, the suffrage to be exercised by proxy. The Convention rejected the proposition. The Convention also voted down a proposition to empower the Legislature to grant suffrage to women; and the Constitution, adopted November 1, restricts the suffrage to male citizens.

In Vermont, November 11, a bill giving "taxable female citizens the right to vote in town, village, and fire district meetings" was rejected: yeas 93, nays 113. The next day a motion to reconsider was lost: 56 yeas, 120 nays.

In South Dakota, November 4, after a vigorous campaign on the part of the suffragists, an amendment to strike the word "male" from the Constitution was submitted to the vote of the people. It was rejected: 22,972 votes were cast for, and 45,682 against, it.

In Kentucky, in the Constitutional Convention, an unavailing attempt was made to secure favorable action on a proposition to extend the franchise to women.

In Oklahoma, in December, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women was rejected by the House: yeas 9, nays 10.

RESULTS IN 1891.

In Maine, a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women, with an educational test, was reported adversely by the Judiciary Committee, February 17, by a vote of 7 to 2.

In Minnesota, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 53 to 40 for its indefinite postponement.

In Kansas, March 2, the Judiciary Committee reported to the Senate adversely on a bill to confer general suffrage upon women, which had been passed by the House, and the report was accepted by a unanimous vote. The House, the same day, voted to indefinitely postpone a Constitutional Amendment giving the ballot to women.

In Massachusetts, March 31, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate: yeas, 9, nays, 22, with 3 pairs.

In California, a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the Senate, but was defeated in the House.

In New York, for the first time in eleven years, the advocates of woman suffrage were not strong enough to get a vote in either branch of the Legislature, though several bills had been introduced.

In Arkansas, a bill to give full suffrage to the white women of the State was tabled in the Senate, because manifestly unconstitutional.

In Arizona, the Legislative Council passed a woman suffrage bill, which failed in the House.

In North Dakota, a municipal suffrage bill passed the Senate, March 2, but was defeated in the House, March 6.

In Nebraska, March 5, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House: 44 yeas, 49 nays.

In Michigan, March 5, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate by a tie vote. The vote was reconsidered and the bill tabled. The bill came up again May 14, and was defeated: yeas, 14, nays 15.

In Illinois, May 21, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate, 21 for to 27 against.

In New Hampshire, April 11, a bill to extend the right of suffrage to women owning taxable property was killed in the House.

THE REASONS FOR REMONSTRANCE.

It is a mistake to suppose that the remonstrants against Woman Suffrage are opposed to the advancement of women. On the contrary their whole work is inspired by a thorough loyalty to what the ages have demonstrated and Christian civilization maintains to be the highest possible ideal of usefulness and happiness for women.

Protection in the home and immunity from public service and labor, in order that her time and strength may be given to the supreme work of creating anew the human race, more and more in the image of God, and for a destiny of progress and brotherhood, is the most ancient, the most fundamental, right of woman, and the one in which the future of the race is most deeply involved.

To the eye of scientific research, the progress of the race develops itself through parentage; the divine ideal being that every generation shall be, through parental care, an advance upon the preceding one. Of this parental care by far the more important share falls to the lot of the mother. The parental work of the father is mainly material; the work of the mother is largely spiritual and tends to the formation of the moral and spiritual character of the public citizen. It is because this work is fundamental, far-reaching, and exhaustive that civilization from the first has decreed that woman shall be protected in the home and set free from civic responsibility, in order that her whole time and strength may be given to her domestic duties. That is the spirit of the old common law of England, France, and Germany. *La femme couverte* is the phrase by which ancient French law designates the married woman. "A woman covered," protected, not a woman enslaved, is the idea with which the law throws about woman the *protection* and immunity of the home.

The great movement of the present century for the advancement of women is not properly a movement for the throwing off of this protection, the abrogation of this immunity, but only for the enlarging of the conditions under which it is exercised, in order that the work assigned to women in the great scheme of race evolution may be more thoroughly, intelligently, and conscientiously performed. With this end in view, it is absurd to bur-

den her with new and unaccustomed duties, duties for which neither her nature nor her vocation fits her.

Nor do the prime movers in this agitation for the political rights of women pretend that such rights would strengthen the hands of women as home-makers, child-bearers, domestic women generally. On the contrary, if you go to the fountain head of Woman Suffrage, which is the revolutionary socialism of Europe, you will find that the aim of these destructionists is to break up the institution of the home, throw woman upon the world to maintain herself by her own labor, to bear children through uncensored relations with men, the State assuming the care of them, thus putting upon woman anew the slavery of bearing children, and at the same time maintaining herself, from which civilization and Christianity are alike endeavoring to rescue her.

This proposition — that Woman Suffrage tends to break up the home, and is urged with that intent by the so-called social reformers with whom the doctrine originated, and who are to-day, in this country and Europe, its most determined agitators; that it lays the axe to the root of all Christian civilization, all the processes of scientific human progress — is capable of overwhelming proof. That proof has been furnished upon needed occasions and can be again. It is these facts, these unalterable convictions, which urge the remonstrants against Woman Suffrage to determined, persistent, and unwearying antagonism to it. — *Caroline F. Corbin, Chicago.*

AN UNJUST BURDEN.

WITHOUT in the least degree impugning the motives or decrying the character of woman suffragists, I sincerely hope that their cause will be unsuccessful, in so far as it would impose the ballot upon women.

In their desire for the better education of women they have my warmest sympathy, though we might not always agree as to what the better education is, or how it is to be effected. But my earliest instinct and my latest judgment combine in maintaining that women have a right to claim exemption from political duty and responsibility, and that men have no right to lay the burden upon them.

If the public work is ill done by men, the remedy is to do it better, not to shift

the weight to shoulders already heavily laden, and whose task they do not propose in any respect to lighten.

I regret to see women engaged in the movement, because it indicates a failure to discern the natural place of woman in the order of creation — the place of eternal superiority and supremacy. It is a movement backward towards men and mastodons, the miocene hipparion and eocene anchitherium — instead of forward, in the direction of woman and the spiritual universe and everlasting light. — *Gail Hamilton.*

WHAT THE EXPERIMENT MEANS.

It is said that the casting of a vote is a slight duty, quickly performed. If it were that simple mechanical act, we might not object to such action; but to cast a vote ought to mean to cast it intelligently and honestly; and how can we gain that accurate intelligence except by attending caucuses, primaries, nominating conventions, and supplementing general knowledge as far as possible by personal acquaintance with candidates? Even if some women have time and ability for such work, most of us have not; and even if we all had the time, is it desirable that the presence and co-work of unintelligent and depraved women should be added to the already jarring factions of political life? Every woman knows that all women cannot purify politics; and if a good woman can vote, so can a bad woman! Therefore, gentlemen, we say that to permit us to vote is to permit us to do many impossible things, which, nevertheless, we ought to do as patriotic women. The point in question is a vexed one between the *pro* and *anti* suffragists. They say we have no right to prevent their doing what they consider to be right, and also that we need not vote because they do. We say that their demand for extension of the suffrage does involve us, and therefore we are put on the defensive against them. Party questions and reform measures of all kinds will arise; we may hold convictions different from theirs, and as we also care as much for our country's welfare as they do, when we see some measure we deem unwise likely to succeed, then, to save our country or State, we must vote; therefore do we beseech you not to grant female suffrage. And if it is replied that women will only vote and legislate rightly,

I answer that I utterly disagree with such a statement. Women, as a rule, will vote on the side of pure moral issues, but they will also vote for illogical, inexpedient measures to secure some narrow, present good, which should be outweighed by the larger issues of legal stability, validity of order, constitutional and States' rights, which are also involved in the immediate settlement of any question. — *Kate Gannett Wells.*

WOMAN'S BEST PUBLIC SERVICE.

THE best work that a woman can do for the purifying of politics is by her influence over men, by the wise training of her children, by her intelligent, unselfish counsel to husband, brother, or friend, by a thorough knowledge and discussion of the needs of her community. Many laws on the statute books of our own and other States have been the work of women. More might be added.

It is the opinion of many of us that woman's power is greater without the ballot or possibility of office-holding for gain, when, standing outside of politics, she discusses great questions upon their merit. Much has been achieved by women in the anti-slavery cause, the temperance cause, the improvement of public and private charities, the reformation of criminals, all by intelligent discussion and influence upon men. Our legislators have been ready to listen to women, and carry out their plans when well framed. Women can do much useful public service upon boards of education, school committees, and public charities, and are beginning to do such work. It is of vital importance to the integrity of our charitable and educational administration that it be kept out of politics. Is it not well that we should have one sex who have no political ends to serve, who can fill responsible positions of public trust? Voting alone can easily be performed by women without rude contact, but to attain any political power women must affiliate themselves with men; because women will differ on public questions, must attend primary meetings and caucuses, will inevitably hold public office and strive for it; in short, women must enter the political arena. This result will be repulsive to a large portion of the sex, and would tend to make women unfeminine and combative, which would be a detriment to society. — *Clara T. Leonard, Springfield, Mass.*

A LOSS OF POWER.

WOMAN will get her rights as she rises to them, and her defences where she needs them; everything that helps, defends, uplifts the woman uplifts man and the whole fabric, and man has begun to find it out. If he "will give the suffrage, if women want it," as is said, why shall he not as well give them the things that they want suffrage for, and that they are capable of representing? Believe me, this work, and the representation which grows out of it, can no longer be done if we attempt the handling of political machinery—the making of platforms, the judging of candidates, the measuring and disputation of party plans and issues, and all the tortuous following up of public and personal political history. Do you say, Men have their individual work in the world, and all this beside and of it, and that therefore we may? Men meet each other in the business thoroughfares, at the offices and the street-corners; we are in the dear depths of home. We are with the little ones, of whom is not this kingdom, but the kingdom of heaven, which we, through them, may help to come. This is just where we must abandon our work, if we attempt the doing of theirs. And here is where our prestige will desert us, whenever a great cause calls us to speak from out our seclusions, and show men, from our insights and our place, the occasion and desire that look unto their rule. They will not listen then; they will remand us to the ballot-box. — *Adeline D. T. Whitney.*

HERBERT SPENCER'S CHANGED VIEWS.

HERBERT SPENCER'S new volume on Justice, which he considers the flower of his philosophical system, is interesting, among other things, for the author's renunciation of his former position regarding the equality of the sexes. He now maintains that there are fundamental reasons for keeping the spheres of the sexes distinct. He still holds that women ought not to be restricted as to their choice of occupation, and that their just claims upon the income and property of the husband should be respected, and he would still allow women local or municipal suffrage; but he draws a sharp line at their voting for members of Parliament or any similar body. He holds that suffrage is conditioned, *de facto*, upon military service or ability therefor. With men, he argues, the possession of the suffrage involves the obligation to become military

defenders of the nation. Women, not having these same liabilities, cannot have the same privileges; otherwise their position would not be one of equality, but of superiority. For that reason, he urges, equal political rights for women cannot be entertained until a permanent state of peace is reached.

Mr. Spencer's second reason against Woman Suffrage is based on the mental and emotional differences between the sexes. Upon this point he says:—

Human beings at large, as at present constituted, are far too much swayed by special emotions temporarily excited and not held in check by the aggregate of other emotions; and women are carried away by the feelings of the moment more than men are. This characteristic is at variance with that judicial-mindedness which should guide the making of laws. . . . At present both men and women are led by their feelings to vitiate the ethics of the State by introducing the ethics of the family. But it is especially in the nature of women, as a concomitant of their maternal functions, to yield benefits not in proportion to deserts, but in proportion to the absence of deserts—to give most where capacity is least. . . . The present tendency of both sexes is to contemplate citizens as having claims in proportion to their needs—their needs being habitually proportionate to their demerits; and this tendency, stronger in women than in men, must, if it operates politically, cause a more general fostering of the worse at the expense of the better.

THE BOSTON VOTE.

THE records of the vote of Boston continue to show a decline of interest and activity on the part of women in the exercise of school suffrage. In 1888, 20,252 women registered in Boston, and most of them voted. In 1889, the number of women registering was reduced almost exactly one half, the figures being 10,589. In 1890, the registration of women dropped to 7,925. At the municipal election in December, 1891, there was a further decline in the registration of women to 6,000, and it is estimated that not more than two thirds of that number went to the polls.

THE Woman's Journal of January 30 frankly admits that the favorable report of the Senate Committee was secured by a kind of trick, thus:—

One or two members of the Senate Committee who are opposed to suffrage had shown their disrespect for the subject by absenting themselves from the hearing. Senator Hoar's experienced eye perceived that of the members present a majority were in favor, and he took advantage of the opportunity to move a favorable report, which was carried triumphantly.

all
1897
p-3

copy

A TRUE AND IMPARTIAL VIEW.

"SYDNEY," the regular Washington correspondent of The Boston Transcript, a paper which is in favor of Woman Suffrage, says under date of January 20, 1892:

The annual Woman Suffrage appeal to Congress takes place this week. It is just like all the others and presents the same curious and illogical features. Here are women of sense, dignity, and experience, like Miss Anthony, Alice Stone Blackwell, and others, although they represent the best and rarest type of woman suffragists, coming and pleading with men for what they should plead with women. For, as Representative Grant, of Vermont, said in substance, not the slightest proof could they bring that women really want the ballot. Everything may be true that they urge, but nevertheless a perfectly overwhelming majority of the thinking and reasoning women of the country don't want to vote and it would be a shocking injustice to those women to force the ballot on them at the demand of a handful of women in no way their superiors. Intelligent women generally will agree that Miss Anthony is a forcible speaker and an able parliamentarian; but how can a woman who has lived the best part of her adult life without a home of her own understand or speak for the vast majority of women who have homes and domestic interests? Congressional committees listen respectfully enough. Favorable reports have even been secured; but no body of legislators yet was ever so wicked or so criminally foolish as to force the ballot upon any section of human society when nine tenths of the intelligent part of it is unalterably opposed. The whole movement is full of gigantic *non sequiturs*. The women concerned in the movement arrogate to themselves a superiority which cannot be proved. They assume to speak for women when ninety-nine women out of a hundred repudiate their theory. They have spent fifty years pleading with men, when the question, Shall women vote? is one to be decided by women themselves. Every member of the House Committee is substantially agreed that if the majority of women wished to vote, they could do it; and even those who disapproved of it could not refuse it if fifteen millions of women demanded it. But only an infinitesimal fraction of them want it, and this fraction seriously proposes a revolution that would involve the dearest interests of all these millions of women without consulting their wishes in the least. However, as long as these ladies confine their principal efforts toward converting the masculine sex there will be but little danger. Men wait to hear from women at large; and they hear nothing but a few clamorous voices while the rest of the sex make, by their mere silence, an all-powerful protest against them. It is flat burglary to say that these ballot-seeking women are not the leaders of thought among the

women of the country; but they are not. Among the really great literary women of the country, the best artists, scholars, and workers that are women, not one in a hundred wants Woman Suffrage or means to allow it to come to pass.

THE EDGERTON HUMBUG.

Two years ago the papers were full of sensational articles about the election of a municipal government composed wholly of women in the "city" of Edgerton, Kansas: and the advocates of suffrage made much of the occurrence as evidence that women were capable of administering public affairs. Suspecting that the affair might have been misrepresented, an inquirer addressed a letter to a prominent citizen of Edgerton asking whether the reports were correct, whether the women actually served in their offices, and what was the population of the place. The following response was received:—

The election of the ladies was a jest, and they never all qualified and they all resigned without having exercised the powers or duties of their offices in the least. There are about 300 inhabitants here.

It illustrates the disingenuousness of the advocates of Woman Suffrage that they should have represented this practical joke in a small Kansas village as a *bona fide* and serious experiment in city government by women.

WOMEN IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

IN an article in The North American Review, Justin McCarthy gives a vivid account of the manner in which women now participate in English politics. The *salon* is gone; in its place is a new institution, the political garden-party, or the political drawingroom-party, led and officered for the most part by women. "On both sides of the political field women exert themselves in a manner which might make Aristophanes turn in his grave. On many platforms now women are speakers as regularly as men." Of the work and methods of the Primrose League Mr. McCarthy says:—

"Lysistrata herself might be proud of the spirit in which the dames of the Primrose League lead the way in their public demonstrations, and the tame and quiet manner in which the men have been trained to take the second place. The Primrose ladies do not confine their work to the making of speeches, although they do a vast amount of speechmaking and some of them do it very well. They organize election arrangements; they can-

vass electors; they manage the work of the polling days; they lend their carriages to bring voters to the polling-places; they take voters in their carriages and personally charioteer them to the poll. As Napoleon said that the business of war consisted mainly in the bringing together of the greatest number of men at a given place and a given time, so the Primrose dames confidently maintain that the success of an election now is often only a question of bringing together the greatest number of carriages at a given place and a given time. They beat the Liberals in the number of carriages, it must be owned."

This account, written by a friendly observer, suggests the form which woman's political activities would take in this country if the suffrage were granted them. And in this country there would be no restrictions of a property qualification, as in England. Would it promote the elevation either of women or of politics to have woman thus participating on the same footing with man in the caucusing, intriguing, wirepulling, and campaigning of political contests?

AT A STANDSTILL.

THE Woman Suffrage movement seems to be at a standstill so far as practical results are concerned. Last year nearly all the legislatures which were in session were besieged with suffrage measures, but the only bill enacted was a school suffrage bill in Illinois which was subsequently pronounced unconstitutional. The summary elsewhere printed shows the unbroken record of defeat as regards other propositions. Abroad, the situation is the same. No vote on the general issue was had in the British Parliament but a bill allowing women to serve as County Councillors was defeated in the House of Commons. Bills to give parliamentary suffrage to women were defeated in the legislatures of New Zealand, South Australia, and New South Wales.

IN Massachusetts the woman suffragists this year are presenting petitions of a purely perfunctory kind, signed by the officers of Woman Suffrage Leagues. This indicates that the increasing majority against suffrage in the Massachusetts Legislature has had a disheartening influence upon the advocates of that proposition, so that they no longer care to bestir themselves to get individual signatures.